UNITED NATIONS

EP

Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/23
20 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 6 of the provisional agenda*

PROGRAMME MATTERS

Recommendations by the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety for international action on persistent organic pollutants

Report of the Executive Director

Summary

By its decision 18/32 of 25 May 1995, the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), invited the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC), working with the International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS) and the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS), to initiate an assessment process on persistent organic pollutants (POPs), starting with an initial list of twelve substances (polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), dioxins and furans, aldrin, dieldrin, DDT, endrin, chlordane, hexachlorobenzene, mirex, toxaphene, and heptachlor). It further invited IFCS to develop, on the basis of the results of the assessment process and the outcome of the Intergovernmental Conference to Adopt a Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities, recommendations for and information on international action, including such information as would be needed for a possible decision regarding an appropriate international legal mechanism on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) for consideration by the Governing Council of UNEP and the World Health Assembly, no later than in 1997.

This report presents the outcome of the assessment of the twelve POPs and highlights the recommendations of IFCS, which are submitted in a separate report of the IFCS Ad Hoc Working Group on Persistent Organic Pollutants (UNEP/GC.19/INF.8).

Suggested action by the Governing Council

* UNEP/GC.19/1.

Na.96-0874 141296 141296

/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

Recalling paragraph 17 of the Washington Declaration on Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities of 2 November 1995, whereby the Governments agreed on the following:

> "Acting to develop, in accordance with the provisions of the Global Programme of Action, a global, legally binding instrument for the reduction and/or elimination of emissions, discharges and, where appropriate, the elimination of the manufacture and use of the persistent organic pollutants identified in decision 18/32 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme. The nature of the obligations undertaken must be developed recognizing the special circumstances of countries in need of assistance. Particular attention should be devoted to the potential need for the continued use of certain persistent organic pollutants to safeguard human health, sustain food production and to alleviate poverty in the absence of alternatives and the difficulty of acquiring substitutes and transferring of technology for the development and/or production of those substitutes;"

The Governing Council may wish to:

1. Take note of the present report and endorse the recommendations contained herein, which were made by the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety to the Governing Council and the World Health Assembly, and

2. Take note also of the secretariat's estimates of the cost of implementing the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety, while recognizing, first that the funds to implement the activities in question have not been identified in the current budget for the 1996-1997 biennium; second that the budget estimate for the 1998-1999 biennium of $1.4 million will address most, but not all, of the staffing needs for the project but will not suffice to address the costs of convening negotiations or expert meetings and, third that $3.1 million will be required over and above the proposed budget for the 1998-1999 biennium, to implement the recommendations in full.

PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF GOVERNING COUNCIL RESOLUTION 18/32 ON PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS

A. Background

1. A number of international activities have recently been initiated to reduce and eliminate the emission and release of POPs. POPs are chemical substances that are persistent, bioaccumulate and pose a risk of causing adverse effects to human health and the environment. It is widely accepted that the use of such persistent, bioaccumulating and toxic substances cannot be considered a sustainable practice. For various social and economic reasons, however, such substances are still in use and/or are being released to the environment. With the evidence of long-range transport of these substances to regions where they have never been used or produced, and the consequent threat they pose to the environment of the whole globe, the international community has, on several occasions, called for urgent global action to reduce and eliminate the release of these chemicals.

2. At the Governing Council session of May 1995, three decisions were taken which are relevant to POPs to various extents.

3. Decision 18/32 addresses directly the need for international action to reduce and eliminate the release and emission of POPs. It invites IOMC, together with IFCS, to initiate an assessment process, starting with a short list of twelve POPs (PCBs, dioxins and furans, aldrin, dieldrin, DDT, endrin, chlordane, hexachlorobenzene, mirex, toxaphene, and heptachlor) that had already been discussed under the long-range transport of atmospheric pollutants (LRTAP) process of the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) in order to:

(a) Consolidate the existing information available from IPCS, ECE and other relevant sources on the chemistry and toxicology of the substances concerned;

(b) Analyse the relevant transport pathways and the origin, transport and deposition of these substances on a global scale;

(c) Examine the sources, benefits, risks and other considerations relevant to their production and use;

(d) Evaluate the availability, including costs and effectiveness, of preferable substitutes, where applicable; and

(e) Assess realistic response strategies, policies and mechanisms for reducing and/or eliminating emissions, discharges and losses of POPs.

Decision 18/32 further invites IFCS to develop recommendations for and information on international action for consideration at the 1997 sessions of the Governing Council of UNEP and the World Health Assembly.

4. Decision 18/31 concerns the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities and a draft Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities. The decision specifically addresses POPs in that it calls on States to consider

how, within the Global Programme of Action, appropriate attention could be given to support action at national and regional levels on POPs. The Intergovernmental Conference to Adopt a Global Programme of Action, held at Washington, D.C., from 23 October to 3 November 1995, declared the commitment of the Governments concerned to protect and preserve the marine environment from the impact of land-based activities, and to do so inter alia by acting to develop a global, legally binding instrument for the reduction and/or elimination of emissions and discharges and, where appropriate, the elimination of the manufacture and use of the POPs identified in decision 18/32.

5. Decision 18/12 refers to the development of a legally binding instrument for the application of the prior informed consent (PIC) and consideration of further measures to reduce the risks from hazardous chemicals. Many of the POP chemicals referred to in decision 18/32 are also covered by the present voluntary PIC procedure. The work to implement decision 18/12, and especially the development of further measures, will thus need to be monitored carefully in connection with the development of international action on POPs.

B. The assessment process

6. In October 1995, an Ad Hoc Working Group on POPs was convened by UNEP, on behalf of IOMC, to develop a plan of work for consideration by the second Inter-Sessional Group (ISG-2) of IFCS. In March 1996, ISG-2 approved the proposed outline of work and took over from UNEP the Ad Hoc Working Group on POPs. In June 1996, IFCS convened in the Philippines an expert meeting and an open meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group to complete the assessment process and develop recommendations on international action for consideration by the Governing Council and the World Health Assembly at their 1997 sessions.

7. The process was facilitated and supported by means of projects initiated by several countries, for example, one project initiated by Sweden, aimed at identifying possible alternatives to existing uses of POPs, and one by the Nordic countries and the United States of America to analyse possible response strategies for international action to reduce and/or eliminate emissions, discharges and losses of POPs.

8. The report of the IFCS Ad Hoc Working Group open meeting, which was attended by representatives from 32 countries, seven intergovernmental organizations and seven non-governmental organizations, was distributed to all IFCS participants for review and comments. Replies were received from 14 Governments, one intergovernmental organization and five non-governmental organizations which provided in general strong support for the conclusions and recommendations reached. A short summary of the replies received has been provided by IFCS.

C. Conclusions and recommendations of IFCS

9. In its report, IFCS recommends:

(a) That the Governing Council of UNEP and the World Health Assembly decide that immediate international action should be initiated to protect

human health and the environment through measures which will reduce and/or eliminate the emission and discharge of the 12 POPs specified in decision 18/32 of the Governing Council of UNEP and, where appropriate, eliminate production and subsequently the remaining use of those POPs that are intentionally produced (paragraph 51);

(b) That the Governing Council of UNEP and the World Health Assembly recognize that, in order to protect human health and the environment, such international action should include (paragraph 52):

(i) The use of separate differentiated approaches to take action on pesticides, industrial chemicals, and unintentionally produced by-products and contaminants;

(ii) The use of transition periods, with phased implementation, for various proposed actions;

(iii) Careful and efficient management of existing stocks of the specified POPs and, where necessary and feasible, their elimination;

(iv) Training in enforcement and monitoring of use to discourage the misuse of POPs pesticides; and

(v) Remediation of contaminated sites and environmental reservoirs, where feasible and practicable;

(c) That the Governing Council of UNEP and the World Health Assembly recognize that international action should incorporate such practical measures as (paragraph 53):

(i) The expeditious development of a global, legally binding instrument. The instrument should be developed in such a manner as to recognize ongoing activities on POPs and other related issues and institutions, as well as differing regional and national conditions and taking into account the special concerns of developing countries and countries with economies in transition. In addition, provision should be made for commitments at a national and regional level allowing for a higher level of protection than that afforded through the global instrument;

(ii) Voluntary measures, which may be implemented as a complement to, or independently of, a legally binding instrument;

(iii) Action at the national, regional and global levels, reflecting possible needs for different regional and subregional approaches and the need to find, at the national level, the most effective and appropriate mix of policy instruments and measures to implement agreed international commitments;

(iv) Consideration of unique customs codes for POPs chemicals, and labelling in compliance with guidelines under the FAO Code of Conduct;

(v) Coordination among different regional and international initiatives on POPs to ensure harmonized environmental and health outcomes from mutually supportive and effective programmes that result in the development of policies with complementary, and non-conflicting, objectives and that avoid overlap and duplication with other international and regional conventions and programmes; and

(vi) Input of scientific, technical and economic expertise and consideration of the ability of existing institutions and organizations to provide this input;

(d) That the Governing Council of UNEP and the World Health Assembly note that socio-economic factors should be addressed in developing and implementing international action, including the following (paragraph 54):

(i) Possible impacts on food production;

(ii) Possible impacts on human health (e.g., for vector control agents);

(iii) Need for capacity-building in countries and regions;

(iv) Financing concerns and opportunities; and

(v) Possible trade impacts.

(e) That the Governing Council invite UNEP to prepare for and convene, together with other relevant international organizations, an intergovernmental negotiating committee, with a mandate to prepare an international legally binding instrument for implementing international action, initially beginning with the 12 specified POPs. Participation in the intergovernmental negotiating committee should be open to Governments and relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, consistent with the applicable rules of the United Nations (paragraph 55);

(f) That the Governing Council of UNEP and the World Health Assembly note the need to develop science-based criteria and a procedure for identifying additional POPs as candidates for future international action and recommend that the proposed intergovernmental negotiating committee be directed to establish, at its first meeting, an expert group to carry out this work. The group should work expeditiously, proceeding concurrently with the process, in order to develop criteria for consideration by the intergovernmental negotiating committee in the negotiation of a legally binding instrument. The process should incorporate criteria pertaining to persistence, bioaccumulation, toxicity and exposure in different regions, and should take into account dispersion mechanisms for the atmosphere and the hydrosphere, migratory species and the need to reflect possible influences of marine transport and tropical climates (paragraph 56);

(g) That the Governing Council of UNEP recommend that the intergovernmental negotiating committee, in undertaking its work, take into account the conclusions and recommendations of the IFCS Ad Hoc Working Group on POPs (paragraph 57).

10. Other IFCS recommendations of relevance to the UNEP programme of work on POPs include:

(a) That UNEP, in collaboration with other international and regional organizations, initiate action on measures needed for the development and sharing of information on the 12 specified POPs, including:

(i) Comprehensive reporting and information exchange, within and between countries and intergovernmental organizations, for (paragraph 21):

a. Peer-reviewed scientific information on the chemistry, toxicology, transport pathways, origin, transport and deposition of the 12 specified POPs on a global scale, in order to provide current baseline and future-trend data for commercial activity, release rates, and levels in environmental and biological media, and to ensure that response strategies are realistic and appropriate, and to provide a basis for assessing progress;

b. Information on the sources, benefits, risks and other considerations relevant to the production, use, and release of the 12 specified POPs; and

c. Information on evaluation of the availability, costs, risks and effectiveness of preferable alternatives to the 12 specified POPs, where applicable;

(ii) Improved access to national information on POPs, as well as improved access to information by all countries, especially developing ones; and

(iii) Improved access to existing and future information on POPs issues by maintaining the UNEP clearing-house for information on POPs, including the electronic database on the Internet;

(b) That UNEP, in concert with other relevant intergovernmental organizations, establish practical measures to evaluate and monitor the success of any implemented strategies, where appropriate, including (paragraph 29);

(i) Baseline and trend data on the production, use and release of the 12 specified POPs; and

(ii) Monitoring networks to establish baseline and trend levels of the 12 specified POPs in environmental and biological media in all regions;

(c) That the availability of information and expertise on alternatives to POPs should be improved through information exchange and education programmes, including: the further development of the UNEP information clearing-house on POPs and alternatives, strengthened regional networks concerning POPs and alternatives, production of case-studies on alternatives, and use of the global information network on chemicals (GINC) to enable Governments to make their own decisions on replacing POPs by alternatives (paragraph 32);

(d) That national, regional or international action be taken in order to ensure environmentally sound handling and disposal of PCBs. This action should include (paragraph 38);

(i) Identification of where PCBs are found;

(ii) Inventories of PCBs in use, stockpiles of PCBs and as PCB-containing waste; and

(iii) An inventory of available destruction capacity for PCBs world-wide in order to obtain a better understanding of regional availability and the need, if any, for increasing the capacity in the coming years;

(e) That appropriate international organizations, in particular members of IOMC in close consultation with IFCS and national Governments, develop a check-list or simple guidelines on how to identify PCB-containing materials that would be useful for countries which have not yet made such an identification, especially developing countries or countries with economies in transition. IFCS noted that the setting up of such a check-list or guidelines should in no way hinder or delay the dissemination of information or ongoing national inventories (paragraph 39);

(f) That countries identify national sources of dioxin/furan releases, using as guidance the sources already identified by developed countries (paragraph 44);

(g) That cooperative programmes (particularly of a regional nature) on aspects of dioxin/furan management be undertaken between developed and developing countries and countries with economies in transition, in coordination with the activities of the IOMC organizations (paragraph 45).

11. The IFCS report reaches numerous additional conclusions which the Governing Council may find of interest. The full report is available as an information document (UNEP/GC.19/INF.8).

UNITED NATIONS

EP

Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/24
20 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 6 of the provisional agenda*

PROGRAMME MATTERS

Progress report on the development of an international legally binding instrument for the application of the prior informed consent (PIC) procedure for certain hazardous chemicals in international trade, and the consideration of further measures to reduce the risks from hazardous chemicals

Report of the Executive Director

Summary

The present report has been prepared in response to Governing Council decision 18/12 of 26 May 1995, by which the Council authorized the Executive Director to prepare for and convene, together with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and in consultation with Governments and other relevant international organizations, an Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, with a mandate to prepare an international legally binding instrument for the application of the prior informed consent (PIC) procedure for certain hazardous chemicals in international trade. It also requested the Executive Director to convene, together with the Director-General of Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, a diplomatic conference for the purpose of adopting and signing such an instrument, preferably not later than early 1997. In addition, the Council invited the Executive Director to convene, in cooperation with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, a Government-designated group of experts, to consider, taking into account the work done in all relevant forums, including the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety, the negotiations on the convention of prior informed consent and the activities to be undertaken in accordance with the Governing Council decision 18/32 of 25 May 1995 on persistent organic pollutants, and recommend what further measures are needed

* UNEP/GC.19/1.

Na.96-0895 141296 141296

/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

to reduce the risks from a limited number of hazardous chemicals, either within or beyond the scope of existing prior informed consent procedure, and requested the Executive Director to report thereon to the Governing Council at its nineteenth session.

The present report discusses the progress made in the development of the legally binding instrument on prior informed consent and the work done by the Government-designated Group of Experts on Further Measures to Reduce the Risks from a Limited Number of Chemicals.

Suggested action by the Governing Council

The Governing Council may wish to

1. Take note of the present progress report on the development of an international legally binding instrument for the application of the prior informed consent (PIC) procedure for certain hazardous chemicals in international trade, and the consideration of further measures to reduce the risks from hazardous chemicals;

2. Encourage finalization in 1997 of the negotiations for a legally binding instrument for the application of the prior informed consent (PIC) procedure for certain hazardous chemicals in international trade;

3. Take note of the work done by the Government-designated Group of Experts on Further Measures to Reduce the Risks from a Limited Number of Chemicals;

4. Consider the recommendations made by the Group of Experts;

5. Welcome the Executive Director's efforts to seek the views of Governments on the possible benefits of an integrated international mechanism concerning the management of hazardous chemicals and encourage her to continue these activities.

I. NEGOTIATIONS FOR AN INTERNATIONAL LEGALLY BINDING INSTRUMENT FOR THE APPLICATION OF THE PRIOR INFORMED CONSENT PROCEDURE FOR CERTAIN HAZARDOUS CHEMICALS AND PESTICIDES IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

1. In accordance with the mandate given in Governing Council decision 18/12, the first session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) for an International Legally Binding Instrument for the Application of the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade was convened in Brussels from 11 to 15 March 1996, hosted by the Government of Belgium. The session was attended by representatives of 80 Governments, the European Commission and a number of United Nations bodies and specialized agencies, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations. The full report on the work of the session has been circulated to all Governments as document UNEP/FAO/PIC/INC.1/10. Ms. Maria Celina de Azevedo Rodriguez of Brazil was elected Chairperson, with Mr. Mohammed El-Zarka of Egypt, Mr. Wang Zhijia of China, Mr. Yuri Kundiev of Ukraine and Mr. William Murray of Canada as the other members of the Bureau. Mr. Marc Pallemaerts of Belgium served as an ex officio member of the Bureau for the session.

2. The Committee made rapid progress, agreed quickly on the Rules of Procedure, and completed a preliminary review of a draft outline of the future agreement. It also established a working group to further clarify which groups of chemicals might be included under the future agreement.

3. The second session of the Committee was held at UNEP headquarters from 16 to 20 September 1996. It was attended by representatives of 86 Governments, the European Commission and a number of United Nations bodies and specialized agencies, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations. The full report on the work of the session has been circulated as document UNEP/FAO/PIC/INC.2/7. At the session, the Committee established a Technical Working Group and a Legal Drafting Group.

4. The Committee made considerable progress, and there are now 21 pages of draft articles, many of which have been discussed extensively. There was a proposal that the scope of the instrument be developed to allow some flexibility in order to include the possibility of considering measures beyond the existing PIC procedure, but a majority of delegations supported a legally binding instrument which follows more closely the existing, voluntary PIC procedure.

5. There was wide agreement that, while the Committee had made substantial progress, many facets of the instrument needed further detailed consideration. A need was seen for at least one further negotiating session before the final session. The third session will be held in Geneva from 26 to 30 May 1997, hosted by the Government of Switzerland. The European Commission has indicated its willingness to make a significant contribution towards the holding of an additional session in Brussels later in 1997.

6. The final session and the Diplomatic Conference are envisaged to be held in late 1997 in the city of Rotterdam, hosted by the Government of the Netherlands.

II. THE VOLUNTARY PIC PROGRAMME

7. The implementation of the existing, voluntary PIC procedure has continued through the UNEP/FAO Joint Programme. Since the eighteenth session of the Governing Council, 12 additional Governments have joined, bringing the total to 148 participating Governments as of 1 October 1996. Decision Guidance Documents for a further 6 pesticides are to be published late 1996, and an additional 12 are being drafted for publication during 1997. In the discussions linked to the development of a legally binding instrument, it has been emphasized at intergovernmental meetings that this work should not hinder the continued implementation of the voluntary procedure.

III. WORK OF THE GOVERNMENT-DESIGNATED GROUP OF EXPERTS ON FURTHER MEASURES TO REDUCE THE RISKS FROM A LIMITED NUMBER OF CHEMICALS

A. Recommendations of the Group of Experts

8. Pursuant to Governing Council decision 18/12, the Government-designated Group of Experts on Further Measures to Reduce the Risks from a Limited Number of Chemicals met in Copenhagen from 16 to 19 April 1996. The meeting was hosted by the Government of Denmark and attended by invited experts from 23 countries, the European Commission and a number of United Nations organizations, specialized agencies and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. Mr. Niels Juul Jensen of Denmark was elected to the Chair, with Mr. Willem Scott of South Africa serving as Rapporteur. The full report with the full recommendations of the Group of Experts is available as an information document (UNEP/GC.19/INF.7).

9. The annex to the present document contains the Group's recommendations in the following areas:

(a) Unwanted stocks of pesticides and other chemicals;

(b) Capacity-building;

(c) Inadequate information; and

(d) Issues related to risk reduction from a limited number of hazardous chemicals, including possible bans or phase-outs.

B. Invitation by the Group of Experts

10. The Group of Experts also took note of a proposal by Belgium and the Netherlands, which received broad support, regarding the possible benefits of an integrated international mechanism concerning the management of hazardous chemicals and invited the Executive Director of UNEP, the FAO Director-General, and the President of the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS) to seek the views of Governments on this issue for consideration by

the UNEP Governing Council at its nineteenth session, by the FAO Council, and by IFCS. The Group of experts endorsed the view that consideration of such a measure should not impede progress on current or possible future negotiations to manage hazardous chemicals.

11. A full report with a summary of Governments' views will be available at the Governing Council.

/...

Annex

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE
GOVERNMENT-DESIGNATED GROUP OF EXPERTS

1. Unwanted stocks of pesticides and other chemicals

1. That UNEP, in cooperation with FAO and in consultation with the secretariats of the Basel Convention, the World Health Organization, the International Labour Organization and other members of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC), as appropriate, constitute an expert group on obsolete and outdated chemicals to provide advice to Governments on:

(a) The further definition of problems, in particular in developing countries and countries with economies in transition;

(b) The prevention, management, reuse or eventual safe disposal of obsolete and outdated pesticides and chemicals;

(c) The further development of guidance documentation for Governments on the prevention, management, reuse or safe disposal of obsolete and outdated pesticides and chemicals;

2. That the Governing Council call upon receiving countries to prioritize their needs and integrate them into their requests for existing funds provided by bilateral and multilateral donors;

3. That the Governing Council call upon donors, in close cooperation with FAO and UNEP and in consultation with industry and other non-governmental organizations, and through enhanced donor coordination, to mobilize financing for the safe management and disposal of obsolete and outdated pesticides and chemicals.

2. Capacity-building

I

That the Governing Council:

(a) Call upon IFCS to identify country needs for capacity-building for the sound management of chemicals and recommend providing a mechanism to encourage partnerships between recipients and donors of technical assistance to help coordinate these activities;

(b) Call upon member organizations of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC), UNITAR and bilateral agencies to further strengthen the coordination of their capacity-building activities;

II

That countries cooperate regionally to harmonize their approaches to manage chemicals safely;

III

That the Governing Council:

(a) Recommend that donors, bilateral/regional/international cooperation and assistance organizations and recipient countries give a higher priority to programmes for the improvement of chemicals management, including programmes which could facilitate training, technical assistance and development of clean technology and safer alternatives to chemicals and chemical use, especially in developing countries and countries with economies in transition;

(b) Take into consideration the global significance of the health and environmental problems caused by chemicals, for example persistent organic pollutants, and the need to develop the capacity of developing countries and countries with economies in transition to manage chemicals safely;

(c) Take into account the special concerns of countries of transit for banned or severely restricted chemicals who may not yet have joined the PIC procedure, so that they could benefit by the application of such procedures to the extent possible;

(d) Request that the Council of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) takes also into consideration the global significance referred in subparagraph (b) above in order to investigate the relationship between the need of countries to develop chemicals-management capacity, in particular to address the global risks posed by local emissions and discharges of persistent organic pollutants, and the four existing "windows" of the GEF operational strategy, as well as other possible options;

(e) Support the action under way within the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and multilateral development banks to develop new or review existing guidelines to ensure that investments involving chemical manufacture or use are made in an environmentally sound manner and, in the case of the multilateral development banks, include in appropriate sectoral projects, the funding of the development of sound chemicals-management infrastructure;

IV

That the Governing Council invite Governments to develop and implement In developing legislation, Governments should, as appropriate, take into consideration relevant activities undertaken by and through intergovernmental organizations a/ including activities related to instruments such as

---

a/ For example, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the World Health Organization (WHO), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), and the

conventions, codes, and guidance materials. In accordance with their respective mandates, United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and the member organizations of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) should assist in building the legislative capacities of Governments.

3. Inadequate information

I

That the Governing Council:

(a) Direct UNEP, as Task Manager for programme area C of chapter 19 of Agenda 21, to report on behalf of IOMC to the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS) at its next meeting, on the activities of the IOMC member organizations to promote information exchange on chemicals;

(b) Request IFCS to recommend to the IOMC member organizations on actions to improve delivery of information, taking into consideration the information needs of consumers, workers, general population, non-governmental organizations, Governments, and others concerned with chemical safety and appropriate provisions for protection of data confidentiality. The recommendations should take into consideration the comparative advantages of each IOMC member organization. The types of information under consideration should include, but not be limited to, chemical hazards, risks, exposure, use, properties, fate, information on production and trade worldwide and nationally, cleaner alternatives and alternative technologies, accident prevention and preparedness, emergency response, socio-economics, and disposal;

II

That the Governing Council, without prejudice to the ongoing negotiations in the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, in order to address identified information needs of importing countries and on the basis of an assessment, conducted by the UNEP secretariat, of the costs, benefits and impacts of measures available, consider further elaboration of provisions, where appropriate, related to:

(a) Notification of control actions;

(b) Labelling of chemicals according to the London Guidelines and the FAO Code of Conduct;

(c) Specific Customs Code for PIC chemicals;

(d) Export notification; and

(e) Import decisions;

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

III

That the Governing Council:

(a) Acknowledge the need for information on toxic releases in the environment in order to identify priority problems, target risk management and measure results;

(b) Encourage countries to adopt Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers and/or other tools needed to generate such information and encourage IFCS to continue work in this area;

IV

That the Governing Council invite IFCS to conclude policy-level discussions in order to reach agreement on the entire set of cutpoints that would make up the harmonized system at or before its 1998 Inter-sessional Group meeting.

4. Issues related to risk reduction from a limited number of hazardous chemicals, including possible bans or phase-outs

1. That the Governing Council consider the conclusions of the deliberations of the Group of Experts on those issues as contained in the annex to its recommendation 4; b/

2. That the Governing Council:

(a) Invite the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS) to develop criteria to identify chemicals, if any, other than persistent organic pollutants or those subject to controls under other legally binding instruments, such as the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, which create risks of international concern as identified in paragraphs 6 and 11 of the annex to recommendation 4 of the Group of Experts and, therefore, should be subject to possible concerted action in a manner similar to that being pursued for POPs; c/

---

b/ See UNEP/GC.19/INF.7, page 14.

c/ Australia considered that the Group of Experts had not identified and discussed specific risks that are not already addressed or capable of being addressed under existing processes, to the extent that would warrant this recommendation. Furthermore, Australia noted that discussion at the meeting of the development of criteria to identify chemicals that might be subject to possible concerted action had been focused on situations where local activities or emissions lead to regional or global exposure (see paragraph 8 of the report of Drafting Group 2 on issues related to possible ban or phase-out of chemicals (UNEP/PIC/EG/1/CRP.3)). The extension, late in the meeting, of this recommendation to situations involving only local risks was therefore inappropriate.

(b) Call upon Governments and relevant international organizations (such as the World Customs Organization) to take action to encourage and facilitate the development of new customs codes and procedures which would support implementation of the PIC procedure and other chemical-risk-reduction measures;

(c) Call upon donors, bilateral/regional/international cooperation and assistance organizations and recipient countries to give a higher priority to programmes for the improvement of chemicals management, in particular with respect to the implementation of concerted efforts to ban or phase out a chemical.

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/25
22 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 6 of the provisional agenda*

PROGRAMME MATTERS

The role of the United Nations Environment Programme as secretariat of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities

Note by the Executive Director

Summary

The present document summarizes the role of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) as secretariat of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities, as agreed at the Intergovernmental Conference held in Washington, D.C., from 23 October to 3 November 1995. It presents the subsequent stages of preparation of the implementation plan, including the conclusions on this issue of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) at its fourth session. Regional and international cooperation in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action, including the clearing-house mechanisms and activities relating to the assessment of the state of oceans and coastal waters, as well as to persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and sewage, is also discussed.

* UNEP/GC.19/1.

Na.96-0833 091296

101296

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

Suggested action by the Governing Council

The Governing Council may wish to:

(a) Take note of General Assembly resolution 51/xxx, adopted on xxxxxxx concerning institutional arrangements for the implementation of the Global Programme of Action;

(b) Endorse the proposed role for UNEP as secretariat of the Global Programme of Action;

(c) Take note of document UNEP/GC/19/INF.4, entitled "Institutional arrangements for implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities";

(d) Request the Executive Director to communicate with the governing bodies of the relevant intergovernmental organizations and programmes, to ensure their leading role in coordinating the development of the clearing-house mechanism in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 51/xxxxx.

I. BACKGROUND

1. The duty of States to protect the marine environment from land-based activities was placed squarely in the context of sustainable development by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in 1992. Subsequently, the UNEP Governing Council, by its decision 17/20 of 21 May 1993, authorized the Executive Director of UNEP to initiate a preparatory process for the purpose of facilitating the adoption by Governments of a global programme of action for the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities. Governing Council decision 18/31 of 25 May 1995 provides additional directives on this issue.

2. Pursuant to these decisions, UNEP convened the Intergovernmental Conference to Adopt a Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities in Washington, D.C., from 23 October to 3 November 1995. The Washington Conference adopted the Global Programme of Action and designated UNEP as its secretariat. It further requested that UNEP, as the coordinator and catalyst of environmental activities within the United Nations system and beyond, should, through its programmes and secretariat role, promote and facilitate implementation of the Global Programme of Action at the national level; promote and facilitate implementation at the regional, including subregional, level through, in particular, a revitalization of the Regional Seas Programme; and play a catalytic role in the implementation at the international level with other organizations and institutions.

3. The Washington Conference also requested UNEP to prepare a proposal outlining a practical plan for implementing the Global Programme of Action. This plan was to include a clear indication of how UNEP intends to carry out its function in this regards, including secretariat functions, its contributions to the clearing-house mechanism, proposals and actions taken on coordination among relevant United Nations and other organizations, and how the relevant UNEP programmes, including the Regional Seas Programme, could be strengthened to play an effective role in implementation of the Global Programme of Action. The present document briefly summarizes actions taken to date by UNEP to facilitate implementation of the Global Programme of Action.

II. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION

4. The implementation plan was prepared by UNEP, with contributions from a number of Governments, secretariats of regional seas programmes, and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. It also takes into account the adopted Global Programme of Action, the report of the Washington Conference including the Washington Declaration, and the report of the Workshop Environmental Science, Comprehensiveness and Consistency in Global Decisions on Ocean Issues, held in London, from 30 November to 2 December 1995. A draft of the plan was subsequently reviewed during 1996 at the following three consultations:

(a) Interagency consultation (New York, 30 January): 1/ The consultation was attended by representatives of the following United Nations bodies, secretariat units, specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations: Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur (CPPS), International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Land-Ocean Interactions in the Coastal Zone (LOICZ), South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), World Health Organization (WHO), International Maritime Organization (IMO), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), World Meteorological Organization (WMO), Coordinating Unit for the Mediterranean Action Plan of UNEP (MEDU), World Conservation Union (IUCN), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), World Bank, International Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (IOC), United Nations Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development (DPCSD), United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (DOALOS), and United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO);

(b) Intergovernmental consultation (New York, 1-2 February): The consultation was attended by representatives of Australia, Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Iceland, Indonesia, Mexico, Netherlands, China, Peru, Poland, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Seychelles, United Kingdom and United States of America, as well as by observers from DPCSD, CPPS and SPREP; and

(c) Non-governmental organization consultation (New York, 6 February): All 27 non-governmental organizations that participated in the Washington Conference were invited to the consultation; representatives of five attended.

III. SUBMISSION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN TO THE COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

5. The draft implementation plan was presented to the CSD Inter-sessional Ad Hoc Working Group on Sectoral Issues held in New York, from 26 February to 1 March 1996, and to the fourth session of CSD, held in New York, from 18 April to 3 May 1996, for consideration within the context of its review of chapter 17 of Agenda 21: Oceans and seas. It served as a basis for the preparation by Governments of a draft resolution on institutional arrangements for implementation of the Global Programme of Action, to be considered by the United Nations General Assembly at its fifty-first session. The revised implementation plan was submitted to an informal intergovernmental consultation, held in Geneva on 30 September and 1 October 1996, to which the same Governments as had attended the previous consultation were invited. The final draft implementation plan is now being presented to the nineteenth session of the UNEP Governing Council.

1/ The reports of this and other meetings referred to in this document and organized under UNEP auspices are available from UNEP upon request.

IV. APPOINTMENT OF THE ACTING COORDINATOR FOR THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION

6. In May 1996, the Executive Director of UNEP designated a UNEP staff member as Acting Coordinator for the Global Programme of Action, working in the UNEP Water Branch. The Acting Coordinator has subsequently been assisted by staff members from the UNEP Water Branch in the performance of specific tasks.

V. REGIONAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION AND THE ROLE OF THE UNEP REGIONAL SEAS PROGRAMME

7. In the Washington Declaration, Governments expressed their commitment to protect and preserve the marine environment from the impact of land-based activities, and declared their intention to do so by, inter alia, cooperating on a regional basis to coordinate efforts for maximum efficiency and to facilitate action at the national level.

8. The development of national and regional programmes of action is of primary importance for implementation of the Global Programme of Action. Thus, the organizations and structures involved in the regional seas programmes are a fundamental mechanism for developing and implementing both globally and regionally coordinated action programmes. National, subregional and regional action programmes are the cornerstone for successful implementation of the Global Programme of Action. Accordingly, fostering and facilitating the formulation, adoption and implementation of such programmes will be a central task of UNEP and its partner agencies.

9. Within this context, UNEP convened an Intersecretariat Consultation in Geneva, on 13 and 14 May 1996. Because of financial constraints, representatives of only eight regional programmes attended (although all 13 regions of the UNEP Regional Seas Programme are essential parts of the UNEP plan for implementing the Global Programme of Action): Black Sea Environmental Programme (BSEP), Caribbean Environment Programme, CPPS, MEDU, North-West Pacific Action Plan (NOWPAP), Oslo and Paris Commissions (OSPAR), South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme (SACEP), SPREP and UNEP. The secretariats of the Eastern African and West and Central Africa action plans provided additional information relevant to their activities on implementation of the Global Programme of Action.

VI. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION

10. The Global Programme of Action drew attention to the crucial importance of effective international cooperation for its successful, cost-effective implementation. This cooperation plays a central role in enhancing capacity-building; technology transfer and cooperation and financial support. Moreover, the Global Programme of Action stressed that effective implementation of the Global Programme of Action also requires efficient support from the appropriate international agencies.

11. To facilitate its effective implementation, the Global Programme of Action also requested UNEP, as its secretariat, to maintain a close partnership with other organizations and bodies, as well as regional bodies supporting the implementation of regional seas and relevant freshwater programmes.

12. Within this context UNEP convened a Joint Intersecretariat/Interagency Consultation in Geneva, on 15 and 16 May 1996. The consultation was attended by representatives of the same eight regional programmes identified in paragraph 9 above, plus representatives of the following nine bodies: FAO, IAEA, IMO, IOC, UNDP, UNIDO, WHO, WMO and UNEP.

13. Strengthening of the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC) Sub-Committee on Oceans and Coastal Areas was recommended by the London Workshop on Environmental Science, Comprehensiveness and Consistency in Global Decisions on Ocean Issues, to be used as an interagency forum with the aim of avoiding the establishment of new groups. In May 1996 in London, the ACC Sub-Committee provided an interagency forum for the exchange of relevant information on action by different agencies in implementation of the Global Programme of Action. The agencies agreed to set aside one day during its annual meetings for discussion of the Global Programme of Action.

14. The Sub-Committee also agreed to an informal meeting at IMO headquarters in London, in November 1996, specifically to concentrate on issues relating to implementation of the Global Programme of Action. UNEP will assume the chairmanship of the ACC Sub-Committee on Oceans and Coastal Areas with effect from 1 January 1997. Appropriate links will be established with the ACC Sub-Committee on Water, in its coordinating role dealing with freshwater.

VII. GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION CLEARING-HOUSE

15. By its decision 18/31 the UNEP Governing Council also requested the Executive Director to produce and make available to countries before the Washington Conference additional information on future funding requirements and opportunities, and on clearing-house activities. Pursuant to that decision, and on the basis of discussions at a consultation, UNEP prepared a document addressing those issues for the Washington Conference.

16. In addition, both the Global Programme of Action and the Washington Declaration recommended the establishment of a clearing-house as a priority for mobilizing experience and expertise, to include the facilitation of effective scientific, technical and financial cooperation, as well as capacity-building. As a first step towards establishing an inter-organizational group to develop the basic design and structure of the clearing-house data directory and its linkages to information delivery mechanisms, UNEP convened a Technical Meeting on the Clearing-house in Geneva, on 26 and 27 September 1996 to which the same Governments as had attended the previous consultations, as well as experienced organizations, were invited. The meeting was attended by representatives of six Governments: Australia, Canada, China, Netherlands, Poland and United States of America; three United Nations organizations: IOC, UNEP and WHO; and five regional programmes: MEDU, SACEP, SPREP, OSPAR and BSEP.

18. The meeting agreed that an effective clearing-house mechanism must be founded on close working relationships between the cooperative organizations. At the global level, the clearing-house will be structured around organizations responsible for source categories, as specified in the Global Programme of Action and further elaborated in the previously mentioned draft United Nations General Assembly resolution on institutional arrangements of the Global Programme of Action. It was hoped that the management and governing bodies of the organizations concerned would take rapid action to provide a mandate and resources for implementing the Global Programme of Action. This global level of clearing-house organization should ensure access to the body of international scientific and technical information and experience. A major regional clearing-house component is also necessary, to provide user access and to adapt information to local circumstances. The regional seas programmes and commissions responsible for regional sea areas will provide the regional institutional framework for clearing-house activities.

VIII. ASSESSMENT OF THE STATE OF OCEANS AND COASTAL WATERS

19. The Global Programme of Action pointed out that there is a need for regular reviews of the state of the world marine environment at the global level, and recommended the establishment of linkages with the activities of international programmes that focus on monitoring and assessing the state of the marine environment and relevant rivers system. The Global Programme of Action particularly identified the Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Pollution (GESAMP) as a mechanism for scientific assessments of the impacts of land-based pollution upon the marine environment.

20. Based on a UNEP proposal to the twenty-sixth session of GESAMP, held in Paris, 25-29 March 1996, GESAMP established a standing Working Group on Marine Environmental Assessments and designated UNEP as the leading agency. A sub-group was also formed to prepare a report on land-based sources and activities affecting the quality and uses of the marine, coastal and associated freshwater environment, as a first step towards the next periodic assessment of the state of the marine environment. To this end, UNEP convened the inaugural session of the Working Group on Marine Environmental Assessments in Geneva, on 17 and 18 May 1996. The meeting established its working procedures, including the role of the GESAMP sponsoring agencies. The meeting was attended by the GESAMP technical secretaries, nine international experts and UNEP representatives.

IX. PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS AND SEWAGE

21. By its decision 18/31, the UNEP Governing Council requested the Executive Director to ensure linkages between the elements of the Global Programme of Action on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and on the management and treatment of urban sewage and similar action being developed in other forums.

22. In the Washington Declaration, the representatives of Governments and the European Commission strongly supported the process set forth in UNEP Governing Council decisions 18/31 and 18/32 for addressing at the global level the priority issues of POPs and adequate treatment of waste water. They declared their commitment inter alia, to give priority to the treatment and management of waste water and industrial effluents; and to act to develop, in accordance with the provisions of the Global Programme of Action, a global and legally binding instrument to deal with POPs.

23. A meeting to establish an ad hoc working group on the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) was convened by UNEP on behalf of IOMC in October 1995. The working group subsequently met in March and June 1996 and developed a workplan, identified resource needs to implement the requirements of decision 18/32, and took note of the Washington Conference, wherein Governments called for a global legally binding instrument on POPs. The working group is supported in its efforts by UNEP and the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS) secretariat.

X. FUTURE ACTIVITIES

A. Regional workshops to address implementation of the Global Programme of Action

24. As indicated by UNEP during the Washington Conference, a series of workshops will be convened during 1996-1997 in each of the UNEP Regional Seas Programme regions, with a view to reaching agreement on regional strategic programmes to address land-based activities. The workshops will be attended by government-designated experts, representatives of relevant United Nations agencies, regional development banks, the private sector and non-governmental organizations. The workshops will comprise the following schedule (the dates and venues for those in 1997 are still tentative):

(a) South-East Pacific, in Lima, November 1996, for five States;

(b) Red Sea and Gulf of Aden/Kuwait Action Plan region, in Bahrain, December 1996, for 14 States;

(c) East Asian Seas, in Bangkok, February 1997, for 10 States;

(d) Mediterranean, in Athens, March 1997, for 20 States;

(e) South Pacific, in Apia, April 1997, for 19 States;

(f) Caribbean, in Kingston, May 1997, for 28 States;

(g) West and Central Africa, in Abidjan, June 1997, for 21 States;

(h) Eastern Africa, in Nairobi, July 1997, for nine States;

(i) South-West Atlantic, in Rio de Janeiro, August 1997, for three States;

(j) Black Sea, in Istanbul, September 1997, for six States;

(k) South Asian Seas, in Colombo, October 1997, for five States;

(l) Northwest Pacific, in Beijing, November 1997, for five States.

B. GESAMP assessment on land-based activities

25. As part of the activities of the GESAMP Working Group and its sub-group, several technical meetings and regional assessments - on which the global assessment will be based - are planned for 1997-2001. Some funds are available from the UNEP Trust Fund to support these activities. The report of the sub-group is expected to be finalized by 1998.

XI. FUNDS

26. The funding status of the various scheduled activities is as set out in the following table.

	Activities	Status
(a)	Regional workshops	Available funds (UNEP) to support one participant/country Proposals submitted to the Nordic countries and the Netherlands (July 1996) Proposals being prepared/submitted to GEF
(b)	GESAMP assessments	Additional funds to be secured Proposals submitted to the Nordic countries and the Netherlands (July 1996)
(c)	Establishment of the coordination office	An interim coordination office has been established as part of the UNEP Water Branch

---

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/26
25 November 1996
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

PR
IVERSITY
97
DNS
N

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 4 (a) of the provisional agenda*

POLICY ISSUES: STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Report on the Global Environment Outlook

Background

1. The Global Environment Outlook report has been prepared in response to Governing Council decision 18/27 C of 26 May 1996, requesting the Executive Director to submit a first report in the new state-of-the-environment report series to the nineteenth session of the Council. An executive summary of the first report of the Global Environment Outlook series is annexed to the present document. The full report (in English) will be available to the Council.

2. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) identified 20 internationally renowned environmental institutions as Global Environment Outlook collaborating centres, and instituted a mechanism for regional consultations, four scientific working groups and United Nations agency participation through the United Nations system-wide Earthwatch. In all, some 450 experts, including many government experts, participated in the preparation of Global Environment Outlook-1.

3. The momentum, capabilities and networks of institutions and experts thus created are important assets not only for UNEP but also in support of international scientific environmental assessment efforts, which will substantively contribute towards the integration of environmental considerations into decision-making for sustainable development.

4. In the light of General Assembly resolution 50/110 of 20 December 1995, entitled "Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme", and in view of the significant contribution which might be

* UNEP/GC.19/1.

Na.96-0845 101296

101296

/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

derived from the present report to the debate of the General Assembly at its special session on the overall review and appraisal of the implementation of Agenda 21, it is proposed that the present report constitute an integral part of the report of the Governing Council to the General Assembly at its special session.

Suggested action by the Governing Council

The Governing Council may wish to:

1. Note with appreciation the timely production of the new, comprehensive report on the state of the world environment, Global Environment Outlook-1, as requested in Council decision 18/27 C, as well as the participatory assessment process (known as the Global Environment Outlook process) which has been established to support United Nations Environment Programme assessment activities, and its components (the scientific working groups, network of collaborating centres, regional and United Nations-wide consultative mechanisms);

2. Concur with the Executive Director's proposal to include the executive summary of the present report, together with the views of the Council thereon, as an integral part of the report of the Council to the special session of the General Assembly on the overall review and appraisal of the implementation of Agenda 21 and to make the full text of the Global Environment Report available to the General Assembly at that session;

3. Approve the continuation of the Global Environment Outlook process and the production of the biennial Global Environment Outlook reports, following the guidelines set out in decision 18/27 C, taking into consideration the recommendations pertaining to future Global Environment Outlook reports which have emerged from the Global Environment Outlook process and subject to the allocation of adequate funding;

4. Urge Governments, United Nations agencies and bodies, and other institutions to participate in, and contribute to, the future activities of the Global Environment Outlook process;

5. Urge Governments to take into account the findings and recommendations of Global Environment Outlook-1 in the development and implementation of their environmental assessment and management actions;

6. Urge major report producers to collaborate and use a common data and knowledge base, comprising indicators, models, scenarios and expert systems, in order to avoid duplication, save cost and ensure that global reports are mutually supportive. Each agency would thus approach sustainable development from its particular perspective, while taking advantage of the information in the other reports to get a complete picture of sustainable development;

7. Request the Executive Director to submit the next report in the Global Environment Outlook series (Global Environment Outlook-2) for the consideration of the Governing Council at its twentieth regular session.

Annex

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT OUTLOOK-1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This first report in the biennial Global Environment Outlook series was initiated in response to the environmental reporting requirements of Agenda 21 and to the UNEP Governing Council decision of May 1995 requesting production of a new, comprehensive report on the state of the world environment in time for the UNEP Governing Council in January 1997. The decision recognized the need to advance consensus on several essential environmental issues and on the implementation of the recommendations of Agenda 21. The report is a snapshot of an ongoing worldwide environmental assessment process.

2. A regional and participatory process was used to produce Global Environment Outlook-1. Input was solicited from 20 regional collaborating centres, United Nations organizations and independent experts. Draft chapters benefited from discussions and recommendations of participants in regional consultations, which also provided valuable suggestions for the improvement and future direction of the Global Environment Outlook series. In later reports, the regional inputs will be strengthened through the further development of the global network of collaborating centres.

A. Global overview

3. The Global Environment Outlook-1 report shows that significant progress has been made in the last decade in confronting environmental challenges in both developing and industrial regions. Worldwide, the greatest progress has been in the realm of institutional developments, international cooperation, public participation and the emergence of private-sector action. Legal frameworks, economic instruments, environmental impact assessment methodologies, environmentally sound technologies and cleaner production processes have been developed and applied. As a result, several countries report marked progress in curbing environmental pollution and slowing the rate of resource degradation, as well as reducing the intensity of resource use. The rate of environmental degradation in several developing countries has been slower than that experienced by industrial countries when they were at a similar stage of economic development.

4. Nevertheless, from a global perspective, the environment has continued to degrade during the last decade, and significant environmental problems remain deeply embedded in the social and economic fabric of nations in all regions. Progress towards a global sustainable future is just too slow and the necessary sense of urgency is lacking. Internationally and nationally, the funds and political will are insufficient to halt further global environmental degradation and to address the most pressing environmental issues - even though the technology and knowledge are available to do so. The recognition of environmental issues as necessarily long-term and cumulative, with serious global and security implications, remains limited. The reconciliation of environment and trade regimes in a fair and equitable manner still remains a major challenge. The continued preoccupation with immediate local and national issues and a general lack of sustained interest in global and long-term environmental issues remain major impediments to environmental progress internationally. Global governance structures and

global environmental solidarity remain too weak to make progress a world-wide reality. As a result, the gap is widening between what has been achieved thus far and what is realistically needed.

5. In the future, the continued degradation of natural resources, shortcomings in environmental responses, and renewable resource constraints may increasingly lead to food insecurity and conflict situations. Changes in global biogeochemical cycles and the complex interactions between environmental problems such as climate change, ozone layer depletion, and acidification may have impacts that will confront local, regional, and global communities with situations for which they are quite unprepared. Previously unknown risks to human health are becoming evident from the cumulative and persistent effects of a whole range of chemicals, particularly the persistent organic pollutants (POPs). The effects of climate variability and change are already increasing the incidence of familiar public health problems and leading to new ones, including a more extensive reach of vector-borne diseases and a higher incidence of heat-related illness and mortality. Global Environment Outlook-1 substantiates the need for the world to embark on major structural changes and to pursue with vigour environmental and associated social and economic policies.

B. Regional status and trends

6. Global Environment Outlook-1 confirms both striking similarities and marked differences among regions in terms of the environmental issues which are of primary concern today. Although poverty and the growing global population are often targeted as responsible for much of the degradation of the world's resources, other factors - such as wealth, the inefficient use of resources (including those of others), waste generation, pollution from industry, and wasteful consumption patterns - are equally driving us towards an environmental precipice.

7. In the report, prominence is initially given to issues associated with poverty alleviation, food security and development, namely, natural resource management to control land degradation, provide an adequate water supply, and protect forests from overexploitation and coastal zones from irreversible degradation. Attention is then given to issues associated with increasing industrialization. Such problems include uncontrolled urbanization and infrastructure development, energy and transport expansion, the increased use of chemicals, and waste production. More affluent societies focus on individual and global health and well-being, the intensity of resource use, heavy reliance on chemicals and the impact of climate change and ozone destruction, as well as remaining alert to the long-term protection needs of natural resources.

C. Regional policy responses

8. The review of policy responses to environmental issues in different regions indicates that, typically, these responses focus first on institutional and constitutional issues, and then on the implementation and enforcement of often disjointed sectoral environmental legislation and regulations. Subsequent actions concentrate on developing comprehensive strategic and integrated plans for the protection of the environment, such as national environmental action plans, and an array of concerted command-and-

control measures. Later, attention is given to introducing market-based incentives, creating conducive environments for voluntary, flexible, and innovative actions and stimulating increased participation and commitment by all sectors of society.

9. Progression through the cascade of policy responses is often constrained in developing regions by weak institutions, insufficient human and financial resources, ineffective legislation, and a lack of compliance monitoring and enforcement capabilities. In other instances, environmental institutions and regulations have been introduced at the request of external forces, such as international conventions and strategies, donor requirements, and structural adjustment programmes, and are only later internalized by countries.

10. In the more developed regions of the world, experience with environmental management and conservation is extensive and of longer duration. Today, countries are increasingly using a mix of command-and-control policies and market-based incentives to achieve cleaner and more resource-efficient production systems and to modify consumers' attitudes. More integrated approaches that rely on cleaner production processes and accounting on a cradle-to-grave basis have not yet been used to their full potential anywhere.

11. Although there is repeated acknowledgement of both the vicious cycle of poverty and its intrinsic linkages with the environment and the urgency to address poverty alleviation, little evidence emerged from the regional reports that effective and concerted actions have been taken since Rio to ensure that environmental policies benefit the poorest members of society. A vacuum still remains at the national level for linking environmental protection to social investment, such as education, better health care and employment generation for the poor, especially women.

12. Empowerment of communities and the growth of environment-oriented non-governmental organizations in civil society are increasingly recognized in all regions as powerful mechanisms to advance sustainable development. Another heartening sign is the tendency to strengthen regional and subregional cooperation worldwide. This might well prove to be one of the most powerful mechanisms to move national and global institutions forward towards sustainable development.

D. Looking to the future

13. The first Global Environment Outlook report concludes with an exploration, based on model analyses, of what we might expect in the future for a selected number of environmental issues if no major policy reforms are initiated. The results in this final chapter confirm trends revealed by the regional chapters. They highlight the integrated nature of the environment and underscore the need for a more systematic analysis of linkages between environment, social, economic, institutional, and cultural sectors and among different environmental issues, such as biodiversity, climate, land, and water.

E. The way ahead

14. Worldwide, rapid and profound changes are occurring in many social, institutional, and economic systems. The continued impoverishment of large parts of the global population, increased disparities both within and between nations, and rapid globalization - particularly through developments in information technology, transport, and trade regimes - are observed. In many countries, there are trends towards the decentralization of environment responsibilities from national to subnational authorities, an increasing role for the transnational corporations in environmental stewardship and policy development, and a move towards integrated environmental policies and management practices. The increased willingness of Governments to cooperate on a global basis is evidenced by the large number of world summits in the last decade. The question arises, however, as to how this willingness is translated into concrete and effective actions. There is greater recognition and popular insistence that the wealth of nations and the well-being of individuals lie not just in economic capital, but in social and natural capital as well.

15. Against this background of change, a number of fundamental global environmental trends emerge in the Global Environment Outlook-1 report:

(a) The use of renewable resources - land, forest, fresh water, coastal areas, fisheries, and urban air - is beyond their natural regeneration capacity and is therefore unsustainable;

(b) Greenhouses gases are still being emitted at levels higher than the stabilization target internationally agreed upon under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(c) Natural areas and the biodiversity they contain are bound to diminish as a result of the expansion of agricultural land and human settlements;

(d) The increasing, pervasive use and spread of chemicals to fuel economic development is causing major health risks, environmental contamination, and disposal problems;

(e) Global developments in the energy sector are unsustainable;

(f) Rapid, unplanned urbanization, particularly in coastal areas, is placing major stress on adjacent ecosystems;

(g) The complex and often little understood interactions among global biogeochemical cycles are leading to widespread acidification, climate variability, changes in the hydrological cycles, and the loss of biodiversity, biomass, and bioproductivity.

16. There are also wide-spread social trends, intrinsically linked to the environment, that have negative feedback effects on environmental trends, notably:

(a) An increase in inequality, both between and within nations, in a world that is generally healthier and wealthier;

(b) A continuation, at least in the near future, of hunger and poverty despite the fact that, at the global level, sufficient food is available; and

(c) Greater human health risks resulting from continued resource degradation and chemical pollution.

17. Four key priority areas emerge from the Global Environment Outlook-1 report for immediate, enhanced, and concerted action by the international community if the world is to reverse the negative environmental trends highlighted in the Global Environment Outlook-1 report. Economic cost-benefit analyses will need to be conducted in conjunction with concerted international action in these areas:

1. Energy efficiency and renewable energy resources

18. Current patterns of energy use require drastic changes, because of their destructive impacts on land and natural resources, climate, air quality, rural and urban settlements, and human health and well-being. The need for ever higher levels of energy to fuel economic development in all regions of the world and the absence of significant worldwide advances in the development and application of alternative energy sources and increased energy efficiency will inevitably exacerbate environmental degradation. Alternative energy sources need to be vigorously pursued and their application enhanced. Energy efficiency still needs to be greatly improved, and emissions need to be reduced. Consideration should be given to declaring an energy decade, or even decades, until such time as energy sustainability is reached.

2. Appropriate and environmentally sound technologies worldwide

19. Appropriate technological improvements, which result in more effective use of natural resources, less waste, and fewer pollutant by-products, are required in all economic sectors. Truly global availability and worldwide application of best available and appropriate technology and production processes, including best traditional practices, need to be ensured through the exchange and dissemination of know-how, skills and technology and through appropriate finance mechanisms. Despite years of deliberation, countries have yet to agree on how to reach consensus on international mechanisms to serve the vital interests of both developers of technologies and those countries that need access to them, as well as on international finance mechanisms.

3. Global action on fresh water

20. Water will be the major impediment to further development in several regions. Greater efforts are needed to resolve issues related to land-based sources of pollution, non-point source runoff from agricultural and urban areas, protection of groundwater reserves, water pricing, the impact of development projects on ecosystems, and competing demands for water among different social sectors, among rural and urban communities, and among riparian countries. Globally, a much stronger, more integrated and extensive programme on water is required, including action to address food-related and health-related freshwater issues.

4. Benchmark data and integrated assessments

21. Assessments are required continually to guide rational and effective decision-making for environmental policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation at local, national, regional, and global levels. To improve the global capability for keeping the environment under continuous review, urgent action is required on several fronts:

(a) Investment in new and better national data collection and harmonization, and in the acquisition of global datasets;

(b) Increased understanding of the linkages among different environmental issues, as well as of the interactions between environment and development;

(c) Enhanced capabilities for integrated assessment and forecasting, and the analysis of the environmental impact of alternative policy options;

(d) Better translation of scientific results into a format readily usable by policy-makers and the general public; and

(e) The development of cost-effective, meaningful and useful methods for monitoring environmental trends and policy impacts at local, national, regional, and global levels.

22. To achieve advances in one or all of these key areas for action, a change in the hearts and minds of everyone will be required, along with a worldwide transition towards resource equity and resource efficiency. The necessary financial resources will have to be made available at national and international levels. Estimates have indicated that if 2-3 per cent of gross domestic product (GDP) could be devoted to environmental education, protection, and restoration, great strides could be made in halting the progress of major negative environmental trends. Implementing the pledges made at Rio to increase development aid to the equivalent of 0.7 per cent of industrial countries' GDP and to provide new additional funding is the prerequisite for initiating action to reverse global environmental degradation.

UN

UNITED NATIONS

EP

Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/27
2 December 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 4 (b) of the provisional agenda*

POLICY ISSUES: EMERGING POLICY ISSUES

Globalization and the environment: Emerging issues on the environment and trade agenda

Report by the Executive Director

Summary

This is a progress report on work by UNEP in response to Governing Council decision 18/3 on globalization and the environment and, more specifically, to those aspects dealing with trade and environment. Since that decision, UNEP has continued to promote, from an environmental standpoint, mutually supportive trade and environment policies. In so doing, it has also taken into account the specific decisions of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), at its third and fourth sessions, relating to trade, sustainable consumption and the financing of Agenda 21, when determining priorities and evolving the detailed activities of its work programme. There has been an ongoing process of consultation on a bilateral and multilateral basis with countries and the relevant international organizations. The strategies for achieving the objectives of the work programme have been highlighting and promoting mutually supportive environment and trade policies, agreements and practices through the analysis of the environmental impact of trade agreements and policies and vice versa; and through the facilitation of consensus-building and the promotion of positive measures to implement environmental policies (including multilateral environmental agreements), such as capacity-building, technology transfer and training and awareness activities.

* UNEP/GC.19/1.

Na.96-0889 141296 141296

/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

In the past year, UNEP has produced a number of technical reports on trade and environment issues which have been distributed widely. UNEP has convened several meetings and workshops at all levels on various subjects, including multilateral environmental agreements and the multilateral trading system, forest policy, eco-labelling, and financial services and the environment. Developments in the area of environment, trade and sustainable development were reviewed at the High Level/Ministerial Round-table Meeting held at Geneva in October 1996.

Suggested action by the Governing Council

The Governing Council may wish to:

1. Note with satisfaction the initiatives of Governments, United Nations and intergovernmental organizations, industry and business associations, non-governmental organizations in supporting and promoting a synergy between and the mutual supportiveness of trade polices and environmental protection;

2. Note with satisfaction the role the United Nations Environment Programme has played in clarifying the relationship and increasing the dialogue between the environment and trade communities and the capacity, especially of developing countries and countries with economies in transition, to participate actively in the debate;

3. Call upon Governments to continue to promote and support efforts to develop mutually supportive trade and environment policies, with particular attention to the needs and requirements of developing countries and countries with economies in transition; and

4. Call upon the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme to:

(a) Continue to promote and support efforts to clarify and assess the environmental impacts of trade patterns and policies and vice versa;

(b) Continue to contribute to and support international efforts to promote a synergy between environment and trade objectives in policy development and implementation;

(c) Continue to contribute to international efforts to promote and facilitate environmentally responsible investments within the financial-services sector.

ACTIVITIES RELATED TO TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT

1. UNEP has, within the constraints imposed by the shortage of resources faced by the organization, made every effort to implement the work programme, including those activities which it was invited to undertake by CSD. Essentially, at its third and fourth sessions, CSD invited UNEP to continue its work on trade and environment, strengthening its cooperation with the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the other relevant organizations (third session of CSD), and in accordance with its mandate (fourth session of CSD). Specific reference was made to examining the effects of trade measures in multilateral environmental agreements on the attainment of environmental goals and on the trade and competitiveness of developing countries, and to considering ways in which positive measures could assist those countries.

2. These CSD recommendations, which are entirely consistent with the UNEP work programme, are being addressed by means of a project focusing on the economic impact of the Montreal Protocol, the Basel Convention and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), with particular reference to the developing countries and countries with economies in transition. This activity, which was able to begin only after earmarked funding had been received, is being carried out in collaboration with UNCTAD. The World Trade Organization (WTO) secretariat, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), CSD and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) secretariat have been invited to participate in the working group established to monitor and review progress. The activity will include case-studies on selected developing countries conducted by selected developing-country institutions. It will attempt to work out criteria for assessing the effectiveness of trade measures in multilateral environmental agreements. A second part of the study will review the existing and potential use of positive measures.

3. Furthermore, UNEP and UNCTAD were invited to develop a framework to facilitate the assessment of the environmental impact of trade policies, taking into account the special needs of developing countries and countries with economies in transition. This invitation is being responded to by the preparation of a series of case-studies, from which some general principles for the development of an assessment framework will be derived, and the execution of a project to assess the impact of changes in trading patterns (due to consumption-pattern changes) on developing countries and countries with economies in transition. UNCTAD, UNDP and CSD have been invited to participate in the working group to review and monitor progress. The study will be carried out through a partnership between UNEP and developing and developed-country institutions. It will focus on a range of commodities, manufactured products and services. It is expected that the activity will, in some measure, address the concern expressed by CSD at its third session regarding the manner in which changing consumption patterns will affect environmental, social and economic conditions in and among countries at all levels of development. At its fourth session, CSD also mentioned UNEP in connection with examining further how trade liberalization can result in environmental benefits and contribute to sustainable development. In this connection, UNEP is carrying out some case-studies in the fishing and forestry sectors.

4. The third specific reference by the third session of CSD, which was echoed again at its fourth session, consists of an invitation to UNEP and UNCTAD to "analyse how transparency and international cooperation could be strengthened with respect to product-specific policies, such as eco-labelling and packaging requirements". In response to this invitation, UNEP convened an additional meeting, at Helsinki in April 1996, of the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Eco-labelling. The meeting focused on issues related to transparency, equivalency and the mutual recognition of eco-labelling schemes. The participants included representatives of both developed and developing countries. Two technical reports on relevant subjects have also been prepared by UNEP. The consist of a publication promoting modalities for collaboration between consumer and supplier countries in respect of equivalency and mutual recognition and a report on "a comparative analysis of environmental criteria in selected eco-labelling schemes".

5. At its third session, CSD recognized the increase in private financial flows and their potential for financing sustainable development and, at its fourth session, CSD emphasized that UNEP should continue to disseminate its two statements on the banking and insurance services industries. In this context, UNEP has, by numerous methods, including holding sector and region-specific workshops, the development of a financial-services newsletter, research activities and the further efforts of its advisory groups, continued to promote the signature of and adherence to these statements, for the purpose of increasing environmental responsibility within the private financial-services sector. At the time of writing, the banking statement had 90 signatories and the insurance statement 61 signatories, including some of the largest companies and groups in the two sectors.

6. An important part of the UNEP work programme has been the promotion of a synergy between trade and environment policies, in the broader sense. This has entailed a number of activities, some of which are briefly described below.

7. A seminar on trade and environment was organized jointly with UNCTAD. This seminar was held on 7 May 1996, in conjunction with the ninth session of UNCTAD, in South Africa and the topics under discussion included multilateral environmental agreements, eco-labelling and capacity-building. The Seminar was attended by more than 50 participants and government representatives. The objective was to brief delegates to the ninth session of UNCTAD on activities and developments in those areas and to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas.

8. The High Level/Ministerial Round-table Meeting was held at Geneva on 30 September and 1 October 1996. The purpose of the meeting was to bring the environment and development perspective to the trade and environment debate. The meeting, which focused on multilateral environmental agreements, trade liberalization and market access, was attended by representatives from 43 countries, including countries in all geographical regions and at all levels of development, and resulted in a statement on the subject. A report of the meeting will be included in the UNEP report to the WTO Committee on Trade and Environment, in preparation for the WTO Ministerial Conference at Singapore in December 1996.

9. UNEP has organized a series of informal briefing sessions on trade and environment issues. The briefings were held at Geneva on 20 and 22 February, 25 April and 26 November 1996. The aim of the briefing sessions was to inform permanent representatives and non-governmental organizations about various topics in the area of trade and environment. The briefing sessions also made possible an open and frank exchange of views. They gave participants the opportunity to provide some input into the work and planned activities of the UNEP Environment and Trade Unit. Two informal afternoon briefing sessions were held on the trade and environment interface: multilateral environmental agreements and WTO, and further topics of briefing sessions included UNEP activities in conjunction with the financial services sector and issues related to biosafety. A paper on trade-related environmental measures in the field of safety in biotechnology was also prepared and distributed, and will form the subject of another informal briefing session. In addition, the Committee of Permanent Representatives, at its fifty-sixth meeting on 16 July 1996, was brought up to date on UNEP activities on trade and the environment.

10. UNEP convened, in collaboration with the World Conservation Union (IUCN), a workshop on the complementarity between trade and forest policy. The workshop was held at Geneva on 27 August 1996 and addressed issues related to trade-distorting policies, market access, the illegal timber trade, and the certification and labelling of timber products. The aim of the workshop was to provide some background on the above issues and to discuss possible policy options. A report of the workshop has been produced.

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/28
9 December 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 4 (c) of the provisional agenda*

POLICY ISSUES: COORDINATION AND COOPERATION WITHIN AND OUTSIDE THE UNITED NATIONS, INCLUDING NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Progress report on good environmental housekeeping practices and guidelines in UNEP and the United Nations system

Report by the Executive Director

Summary

This report responds to Governing Council decision 18/10 of 26 May 1995, by which the Council requested the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to consider and recommend strategies for the promotion of best practice in environmental housekeeping for use by UNEP at its headquarters and regional offices, and to advise and encourage the other organizations of the United Nations system to develop and apply similar strategies for continually improving their own environmental performance and promoting sustainable development. This Governing Council decision was recognized by the General Assembly at its fiftieth session as an issue of special importance. The decision further elaborates on the contents of chapters 29 and 30 of Agenda 21. This report reviews progress made in promoting good environmental housekeeping practices within UNEP, the United Nations system and the wider community.

Suggested action by the Governing Council

The Governing Council may wish to:

(a) Take note of the present report; and

(b) Encourage the Executive Director to continue her initiatives in this area.

---

* UNEP/GC.19/1.

Na.96-0868 141296 141296

/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

I. PROGRESS MADE IN GOOD ENVIRONMENTAL HOUSEKEEPING PRACTICES IN UNEP

1. Good environmental housekeeping should focus on concepts such as "the three Rs", i.e. reducing, reusing and recycling. Good environmental housekeeping practices can range from printing documents on both sides of a sheet of paper and reducing energy consumption to reviewing the environmental performance of suppliers (green procurement) or instituting green building codes.

2. The General Assembly has recognized the importance of good environmental housekeeping practices through its resolution 50/110, whereby UNEP Governing Council decision 18/10 was endorsed. UNEP subsequently relayed the Governing Council decisions to the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC) at its first regular session of 1996 and was requested by ACC to provide updates on progress with respect to this initiative to ACC at its subsequent sessions (ACC/1996/2).

3. Before the decision was adopted, UNEP had already introduced a number of measures aimed at both saving costs and being environmentally friendly. These include:

(a) Waste paper from the Gigiri offices is collected by a contractor for recycling. In return, UNEP receives toilet paper for use in the compound. The savings from this programme amount to about US $880 per month;

(b) Staff members have been encouraged to use scrap paper for drafting purposes, to employ double-sided copying and printing and to make increased use of e-mail for memoranda and letters, in an effort to save paper and cut costs;

(c) Almost half the water consumed at the Gigiri compound is recycled. About 250 cubic metres of waste water are recycled and cleaned per day. The recycled water is used for watering the grounds at a saving of about $ 2,000 per month;

(d) Gigiri staff members are able to recycle glass bottles through a recycling programme set up in cooperation with a local non-governmental organization;

(e) No artificial fertilizers or pesticides are used in the maintenance of the grounds. The contractors manufacture compost from on-site garden waste and use it to fertilize the gardens. The presence of natural predators and careful gardening practices eliminate the need for reliance on pesticides; and

(f) The Print Shop reuses off-cuts and small stocks of paper for the production of note-pads for in-house use. Recycled paper is used for all UNEP publications and documents printed in the Print Shop, with the exception of specialist paper types. Non-reusable off-cuts and other waste paper are recycled in the above-mentioned recycling programme. Savings from these efforts are substantial but difficult to assess, since the volumes processed vary with the workload.

4. Subsequent to Governing Council decision 18/10, the following UNEP activities in respect of good environmental housekeeping practices have been undertaken:

(a) The appointment of a coordinator for good environmental housekeeping practices in the Office of the Assistant Executive Director, Programme. With the assistance of the management and administration of UNEP, the coordinator's responsibilities include promoting awareness of good environmental housekeeping among the staff, informing the staff of new activities and initiatives, recommending implementation of best practices, and tracking progress;

(b) The organization of a forum to enable staff members to exchange ideas and suggestions on good environmental housekeeping practices. As a result, a small task force of interested staff members, The Green Consumer's Group, now meets regularly to suggest action to be taken;

(c) The installation of timers on water-heating systems so that there is no heating during off-peak times (i.e. weekends and evenings). In all, savings of about $ 2,000 per month are being generated. It is estimated that the installation cost will have been recovered within five months;

(d) Timers have been installed on the corridor lighting, whereby it is reduced during off-peak times (i.e. evenings and weekends). Monthly savings of about $ 400 are being generated and the cost of the installation will have been recovered in 12 months;

(e) Energy savings are being realized through the installation of individual switches for lights in offices. Staff members are now able turn on individual ceiling lights instead of all the lights in a room. Monthly savings of about $ 500 are being generated and the cost of the installation will be recovered in 16 months;

(f) Procurement of recycled copying paper for all UNEP letters and memoranda;

(g) Assessment of the existence of ozone-depleting substances at Gigiri and development of a plan of action to phase out these substances, with the help of the OzonAction Programme;

(h) Initiation of a UNEP-wide effort to reduce the volume and size of the documentation prepared for official meetings convened by UNEP;

(i) Initiation of a plan to expand the recycling facilities in the Gigiri compound. An expansion would include paper, glass and metal recycling facilities, for both the United Nations offices at Gigiri and the members of their staff; and

(j) Encouraging the regional and outposted offices of UNEP to develop good environmental housekeeping practices within their offices as well as with their partners and collaborators. A specific example of a regional initiative involves the Regional Office for North America. As its offices recently required substantial renovation, RONA set up a task force of the relevant private-sector and United Nations bodies to ensure that the

alterations comprised state-of-the-art green building practices. It is anticipated that, on completion, the offices will become a showcase for such practices within the United Nations system. Other offices are all reusing and recycling paper and, where possible, using green procurement practices. All UNEP offices are continually seeking innovative methods both to save costs and to minimize environmental damage.

II. PROMOTION OF GOOD ENVIRONMENTAL HOUSEKEEPING PRACTICES TO THE WIDER COMMUNITY

5. As well as working on in-house practices, UNEP is promoting the concept of good environmental housekeeping among organizations outside the United Nations system. The hotel and tourist industry, production industry and universities are a few examples of other sectors that have been encouraged to implement good environmental housekeeping practices. Specific activities include:

(a) The UNEP Industry and Environment Centre (UNEP/IE) devotes a major part of its efforts to promoting good environmental housekeeping - encouraging cleaner and safer industrial production and consumption patterns. For example, the Cleaner Production Programme has determined from the results of demonstration projects carried out around the world that between 30 and 40 per cent of the wastes generated can be eliminated through good housekeeping practices, such as improving process control, changing raw materials, training employees and improving inventory control. In addition, the OzonAction Programme is preparing guidelines on the phase-out of ozone-depleting substances for use both inside and outside the United Nations system. Relevant publications issued by UNEP/IE include; "Environmental Action Pack for Hotels", "Environmental Auditing" and "Company Environmental Reporting". These publications, which take the form of user-friendly direct-action guides, encourage the implementation of good environmental housekeeping practices in a variety of industrial sectors;

(b) The Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) has developed an action plan on good environmental housekeeping activities in conjunction with hotel and tourist associations in Thailand. The agencies have worked together to provide training and exhibitions for hoteliers on the green hotel concept. It is now at the stage where the "Green Leaf Criteria", which are about to be finalized, will encourage hotels to make savings in energy and water, to minimize waste and so forth. By early 1997, the Green Leaf Criteria will be formally launched industry-wide. From this model developed in Thailand, UNEP hopes to expand the concept to other countries in the region;

(c) The Environmental Training Unit is running a project on Campus Ecology in conjunction with Moi University in Kenya. With the assistance of UNEP, the University is developing documentation on Campus Ecology which, after assisting to green its surroundings, will be used as a model for other campuses in the region;

(d) UNEP has developed a Global Environmental Citizenship Project which endeavours to work in partnership with major groups to promote and encourage environmental awareness, education and action in civil society with

the goal of long-term behavioural change. Thus far, through the efforts of the programme, a pilot project has been established with a global network of consumers' organizations and UNEP information on environmental practices is reaching supermarkets and consumer products. Also, in cooperation with an international non-governmental organization and community colleges in Canada, an electronic publication "Greening Campuses" has been produced. The publication is a practical guide to applying environmental citizenship principles in the everyday life of community colleges in Canada; and

(e) UNEP has developed a handbook, "Taking Action: An Environmental Guide for You and Your Community", to enable individuals, community groups, schools and the like to make a positive impact on their local environment. It stresses the fact that it is for each of us to change his or her consumer practices and related actions to improve the environment at all levels.

III. EFFORTS REPORTED BY OTHER UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATIONS

6. UNEP has encouraged other organizations in the United Nations system to implement good environmental housekeeping practices and to report on such activities. On 8 October 1996, a letter was sent to the sister agencies urging more action on good environmental housekeeping. Efforts by other organizations include:

(a) The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), in close collaboration with UNEP, produced, in March 1995, a publication called "The Green Office Programme" designed to introduce the idea of good environmental housekeeping practices. The document also introduces the UNDP/Inter-Agency Procurement Services Office (IAPSO) environmental standards concerning such items as paper, office supplies and machines and motor vehicles. UNEP has had a major role in developing these standards;

(b) The World Bank recently committed itself to carrying out a greening process of the World Bank Group. Previously implemented practices have included energy conservation, waste recycling and environmental guidelines for food services and rented properties. These efforts will be reviewed and improved, while additional actions will include conducting an annual independent environmental audit, encouraging staff to use alternative transport, and implementation of the measures in all its outposted offices; and

(c) The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) reports that its new headquarters building, currently under construction, will have a number of innovative technical solution in its design, to make it more environment-friendly. These solutions will save energy and money for WMO. They include: insulated building facades, elimination of false ceilings for improved ventilation and "intelligent" lighting systems.

7. UNEP will continue to make a compilation of the best practices engaged in by other United Nations organizations, and will utilize this information to promote good environmental housekeeping practices among other organizations both inside and outside the United Nations system.